



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,257	07/31/2001	Richard J. Redpath	RSW920010136US1	2814

7590 07/12/2005

A. Bruce Clay
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2195

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

87

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,257

Applicant(s)

REDPATH, RICHARD J.

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/7/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai et al (6,108,714) in view of Holland (6,243,860).
4. As per claim 1, Kumagai teaches the invention as claimed including a method in a server computer for chaining applications, comprising:

receiving , at a chaining module a request from a client computer for a service and an option associated with a chaining module, wherein the option identifies the service as a series of applications; (col. 1 lines 23-35; col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 2 lines 44-5; Fig. 15, s32, s35; col. 5, lines 47-51; col. 7, lines 31-35).
5. Kumagai does not specifically teach the use of passing the output of one application to the other.

Holland teaches executing the series of applications in order and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; fig. 2b; col. 2 lines 59-65; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20); and returning a result of the service to the client computer (fig. 2b, 38,8; col. 6 lines 1-9).

6. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Holland and Kumagai because Holland's use of and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application would improve Kumagai's system by reducing the resources needed to translate different languages.
7. As per claim 2, Kumagai teaches a method the service is registered and associated with a name in a properties file (col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).
8. As per claim 3, Kumagai teaches a method wherein the option is specified in the properties file (col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).
9. As per claim 4, Kumagai teaches a method wherein the series of applications comprises a first application and a second application and the step of executing the series of applications comprises:

executing the first application (fig 15, s32; col. 1, lines 37-50); and

executing the second application (fig 15, s35; col. 1, lines 37-50).

Holland teaches executing the series of applications in order and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

10. As per claim 5, Holland teaches a method wherein the step of executing the series of applications further comprises, returning the output of the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).
11. As per claims 6, Holland teaches a method wherein the first application is a customer verification application (col. 20 lines 10-12).
12. As per claims 7, Holland teaches a method wherein second application is a language translation engine (col. 1 lines 14-20; col. 19 lines 25-32).
13. As per claims 8, Holland teaches a method wherein the first application and the second application are language translation engines (col. 1 lines 14-20; col. 19 lines 25-32).
14. As per claim 9, Kumagai teaches an apparatus for chaining applications, comprising: receiving , at a chaining module a request from a client computer for a service and an option associated with a chaining module, wherein the option identifies the service as a series of applications; (col. 1 lines 23-35; col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 2 lines 44-5; Fig. 15, s32, s35; col. 5, lines 47-51; col. 7, lines 31-35).

Holland teaches executing the series of applications in order and passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; fig. 2b; col. 2 lines 59-65; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20); and returning a result of the service to the client computer (fig. 2b, 38,8; col. 6 lines 1-9).

15. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected based on the same rejections as claims 2 and 3 above.

16. As per claim 12, Kumagai teaches an apparatus for chaining applications, comprising:
a first application (fig 15, s32; col. 1, lines 37-50) and
a second application (fig 15, s35; col. 1, lines 37-50).

Holland teaches a chaining module, wherein the chaining module receives an option that identifies a series of applications comprising the first application and the second application, executes the first application, passes the output of the first application to the input of the second application, and executes the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

17. As per claim 13, Kumagai teaches an apparatus wherein the option is specified in a properties file(col. 1, lines 50-56; col. 7, lines 2-20).

18. As per claim 14, Holland teaches an apparatus wherein the chaining module returns the output of the second application (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

Art Unit: 2195

19. Claims 15-17 are rejected based on the same rejection as claims 6-8 above.
20. As per claim 18, Kumagai teaches an apparatus wherein the first application and the second application implement an interface (col. 1 line 16-21; col.1 lines 52-56).
21. As per claim 19, Kumagai teaches an apparatus module implements the interface, wherein the chaining (col. 1 line 16-21; col.1 lines 52-56).
22. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected based on the same rejection as claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed 4/01/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
24. In remarks applicant argues in substance that:
 - a. Kumagai does not teach a client/server computer system
 - b. Kumagai does not teach the use of a chaining module
 - c. Holland does not teach the use of passing the output to the input of another application.
25. However, prior art shows:
 - a. Kumagai does teach a parent/child computer system (col. 1 lines 23-35; col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 2 lines 44-5; Fig. 15, s32, s35). A parent/child computer system pertains to a relationship between nodes in a tree data structure in which the

Art Unit: 2195

parent is closer to the root than the child. This is the same as client/server architecture.

- b. Kumagai teaches a inter-application link system (col. 1 lines 23-35; col. 30, lines 1-14; col. 2 lines 44-5; Fig. 15, s32, s35; col. 5, lines 47-51; col. 7, lines 31-35).
- c. Holland teaches passing the output of each application to the input of the next application in the series (fig 2a, 26,28; col. 5 lines 60-67; col. 20 lines 1-20).

26. Examiner would also like to point out prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yang et al (5,493,525) teaches the use of a compiler that is based on carry chain structures. Christensen et al (5,333,304) teaches the use of an application compiler based on prelude routines.

Conclusion

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the

Art Unit: 2195

statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

NS
June 27, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100